

-----Original Message-----

From: Charlotte Zajac [<mailto:whalecar@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Saturday, January 26, 2008 12:53 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: MLPA process

I feel that while the MPA process went forward, tons of supportive e-mails for closing areas to fishing, came in from divers and eco-tour operators which were used to make the ultimate decisions we now have to live with. I feel that Laotians, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Mexicans, Chinese and whole range of U.S.

citizens who do not speak English yet fish for subsistence off of our piers, jetties, cliffs and beaches all along our coast have been excluded from the MLPA process. I just wonder if the B.R.T.F. were negligent on their behalf. It happens to be quite a large oversight though, as I didn't know that being a non-english speaking U.S. citizen precluded you from engaging in the process. As far as I can tell, a huge segment of the fishing population has been systematically omitted from this process. Did these people not buy licenses? Do they not pay state taxes?

Can it be easily be shown that the MLPA public outreach has been self serving and has avoided the real user groups? I feel that discrimination based on ethnicity is unethical. Maybe this whole process has been flawed from the very beginning treating divers and other affluent members of the public with respect while ignoring a whole segment of the populace. Did over-zealous biologists exclude user groups from the very beginning?

It seems to me that the whole process has been derailed by private funding. This money has been used to steer the process onto a new tract. Under the new management fishermen and women have been vilified as they are the least represented and protected group of people in the country, partly because they are, or were, the last truly free people in this country. In the past management mistakes were made but the DFG in the past 10 years enacted some of the most restrictive regulations on the fishing in the world. Many fishermen are one bad check away from boat abandonment. This is unnecessary. Fishermen and women are fishing sustain-ably and want clean waters to supply a healthy product to the -public. Because of the restrictions I have less fish available but have to market them more creatively to add value to the product. This is because 90% of rock fish areas have been closed for years!

The truth now:

A. Stocks have rebuilt more quickly than was thought

B. The basic ocean conditions which make California waters some of the most rich fisheries in the world are still there

C. Fishing fleets are a fraction of what they used to be. MPA are going to be counter productive because they force everybody into smaller fishing areas rather than the obviously better solution, which is to spread fishermen out over larger tracts of the ocean.

As a fisherman for 30 years, I can tell you that land based pollutants are the biggest threat. Large amounts of sewage pour into sanctuary waters. The scariest pollution though is E-waste. The very group that is pointing an accusatory finger at the fishermen are contributing to the 1.9 million tons of E-waste i.e. computers, monitors, 70% of which still wind up in land fills. These PC's leak arsenic, lead, mercury, cadmium, beryllium, pvc, and brominated flame retardants, as well as dioxin into the ground. Many of

these chemicals cause cancer in the liver and kidneys and harm fetal development. As these new found chemical brews leach out of landfills and into our seas, where are the concerned biology majors we need to study these effects? What do these chemicals do to the larvae of fish and other invertebrates?

These places of abundance were discovered by fishermen and were used by them to make a living. By necessity fishermen are environmentally conscious and are conservationists. Who are these people who deny out ability to coexist with nature in a sustainable way? I'll bet they have never been out on a fishing boat. U.S. fishermen have fought oil companies, pollution, foreign fleets and any threat to the ocean while risking their lives feeding Americans. Is this the thanks we get? We are the eyes and ears out there, reporting on pollution, spills and other problems. Think about it you get rid of thus and you lose the first line of defense. We are unnecessarily losing our jobs while the public gobbles up farmed fish and wild fish from other countries with lax or no regulations whatsoever. The media assault on fishermen sounded like the lead up to the war in Iraq. To see pollution that effects fish populations, you may not have to look any farther away then you toilet bowl! Discarded birth control pills and molecular traces of these and other pharmaceuticals wind up in the ocean and harm the development of fish eggs and developing larvae. Your own urine and feces may be harming fish more than the fisherman next door! j

So, while it's been great fun blaming the fishing community for any ocean problems, let us all remember that there are two sides to every story. If these ocean conservancy groups would have stopped vilifying us we could have worked together, but, alas this seems to be an c goal, as they have come in with a biased scientific ideal and have made their research fit the desired outcome. It has been shown that this actually happens a lot when they have they have studied the scientists doing the studies. The process has been self serving based on unsound science and oriented towards the desires of special interest groups. The powers that be should stick to motorcycle riding and steer clear of ocean policy making. Our supposed representatives in the MLPA process are part of the NCCRSNG. They cannot "if a NCCRSNG member consistently deviates from these ground rules, that member may be replaced by another person upon confirmation by the director of DFG and the chair of the BRTF." and "media contacts regarding the project form a "big picture" perspective will be handled by MLPA initiative and DFG staff." "NCCRSNG members recognize... statements made to the media could undermine the success of the MLPA process. NCCRSNG members agree to avoid making statements to the media that may prejudice the projects outcome."

How can this process be fair when these kinds of limitations are imposed on the free thought of the members of the NCCRSNG who are supposedly representing the stake holders? Is this your idea of a transparent and fair process?

In conclusion, the only beneficiaries of the no-take-zones will be the sea lions whose populations have already snow balled out of control. This will exacerbate the problem of aggressive sea lions taking over boat docks and piers and the benefits of the MPA's will simply be gobbled up by hungry sea lions. In the beginning, the BRTF compared other MPA's world wide to California but those areas did not have sea lions. No study was ever done on these potential problems. The desire for putting a strangle

hold on the media shows that the process lives in fear of being exposed
for what it really is ... a destruction of public rights.
Christian Zajac Commercial Fisherman